

DRAFT Minutes of the
Advisory Committee on Space Allocation and Design
Senate Caucus Room
August 24, 2006

Chairman Denney called the meeting to order at 8:45 am. Present were Senators Stegner, Geddes, Cameron and Werk and Representatives Deal, Black, and Jaquet. Also present were Pam Ahrens, Director, Dept. of Administration; John Maulin, Capitol Restoration Architect, CSHQA; Paul Brown and Jim Mallen, 3DI; Rich Bower, Lemley 3DI; Tim Mason and Jan Frew, Division of Public Works; Jeannine Wood and Rusty Horton, Senate Staff; Pamm Juker and Terri Franks-Smith, House Staff; Dawn Hall, Division of Financial Management; Sheila Ison and Robyn Davis, Legislative Services; and staff members Jeff Youtz, Eric Milstead and Lisa Kauffman, Legislative Services.

Chairman Denney asked for approval of the minutes from the May 19, 2006 meeting. Representative Deal made a motion to accept the minutes; motion was seconded by Senator Stegner. Unanimous consent to accept the minutes from the May 19, 2006 meeting.

Pam Ahrens addressed the committee and updated them on the Capitol Commission meeting that took place in June 2006. The Capitol Commission approved the methodology for construction management which will be covered by Jan Frew. Director Ahrens has also met with the Building Authority and in order to comply with the Legislative Directive in HCR 47 and keep the project on track for April 2007, the bonding process must go forward. This summer the Land Board approved the bonding process for the project. Permission was needed to get the premise lease for the ground that the Capitol sits on, and the Land Board gave that approval at their June 2006 meeting to the Building Authority for 35 years. All of the approvals outside of the Building Authority have been granted except for the approval by the Capitol Commission of the project budget which will be addressed at their Sept 1, 2006 meeting. The next phase in this project will be to work with the Idaho Historical Society who will be responsible for evaluating the inventory and artifacts in the building and then determining what will be moved to the swing spaces and what will be stored and archived until the renovation is completed and the items can be moved back to the Capitol. Ms. Ahrens stated that the biggest challenge for the Capitol Commission will be to meet everyone's expectations within the budget and the money that has been allocated since construction costs are changing daily.

Senator Geddes said he had heard that there were concerns expressed by the people who are looking at the bonding saying that the cost for this project has been underestimated and that the final figure is likely to exceed the original amount by 3x the initial projection and he would like clarification on this. Director Ahrens replied that 3x was grossly over exaggerated. She spoke with Wayne Muellman, Bonding Authority, and the initial numbers that were given to him a few weeks ago were over what the original numbers in the HCR 47 were listed as. Since that time, there has been a lot of work done on cost estimates and those estimates are now closer to a true number and reflect the inflationary

costs. Director Ahrens feels that those estimates now reflect a number which the Capitol Commission and the Building Authority will be comfortable with. Director Ahrens stated that the first set of numbers were based on a cost estimate of doing everything that everyone wanted to do and then those numbers were evaluated and discussions took place as to what we could afford to do, so that is where they are at this time and those numbers are what they will bring to the Capitol Commission at their Sept 2006 meeting.

Senator Geddes asked based on an inflationary standpoint, does the Legislature need to address this issue early next session to grant the flexibility in HCR 47 so the project can go forward as planned. Director Ahrens replied that at this point she cannot answer that because they may well be within the parameters of the resolution at this time.

Jan Frew, Project Manager, Division of Public Works, gave the committee a brief update on the status of the Capitol Restoration and Expansion Project. DPW has met with the user groups in the Capitol and has compiled a list of space requirements and system needs in order for them to move forward with the design. Drilling on the Capitol grounds has been done for both geotechnical and soil testing as well as the installation of two monitoring wells to measure the water levels which will aid in determining what type of foundation system will be needed for the underground wings. They have also been working on developing a design guideline for the wings since they are being done with a design build method of delivery and the RFQ (Request for Qualifications) and the initial responses will be back on Monday. Lemley 3DI has been developing the design guidelines or project definition that will be issued to the applicants that are prequalified. The floor plans that are being shown to the committee today are based on the input from previous meetings and from the staff.

Ms. Frew stated the design plans, as presently shown, are beyond the desired budget for this project. As the design moves forward from this point it will be refined and issues raised will be addressed such as constructability issues and construction risks with placing the wings immediately adjacent to the current structure. DPW is looking at less expensive options in placement of the wings. They are also looking at the size of the wings. They believe they can meet all the needs requested for approximately 45,000 square feet on each side and still have a little bit of room for expansion and future growth. As the design process continues the size of the wings may go up or down in conjunction with cost control of the budget.

A few items requested were more costly than originally projected, mainly bringing the level of finishes in the current garden level up to a compatible standard with the rest of the building and reconfiguring the elevators to run from the lower level up to the 4th floor. Also, it was identified that the most efficient way to bring services to the new wings is by extending a utility tunnel which would connect with the current tunnel located on the North side of the Capitol. Another area of concern is the areaway modifications around the building. The original design was to leave them sloped and just refinish them, but the new designs showed the walls running straight up and down with large planted areas. The next step for DPW is to continue working on the refined designs and come up with a reasonable budget that they feel would meet the intent of the resolution.

Ms. Frew asked the committee for decisions on the following to be provided to DPW today:

- Identification of participants who would be willing to sit with them on a Selection Committee that would select the Design Build Team
- Identification of participant(s) who would assist DPW in selecting a Construction Manager At Risk
- Designees to approve the final floor plans
- Consider a late request to accommodate the Office Of Performance Evaluation in the wings

Representative Deal asked Ms. Frew to clarify the relocation of the wings in relationship to siting next to the existing Capitol and wanted to know what was different from the original plan. Ms. Frew replied that after looking at the needs that were presented they only need to build 45,000 square feet on each side which gives the designers more flexibility as to how to connect the wings to the existing building. This means that they don't have to build closer to the street to get the square footage and they can pull the wings addition away from the existing building by about 10-15 feet which will increase stability of the existing foundation. This has been an area of concern both structurally and budget-wise since they are not entirely sure what they will find when they begin construction.

Senator Werk inquired that if they are going to offset the entry into the wings by 10-15 feet would we have some type of hallway feature that leads into the area and would they be able to give the appearance of a seamless transition, so it wouldn't appear that you were leaving one building and entering into another. Ms. Frew responded that they believe they can develop a plan where the feeling would be of one building with the use of consistent finishings throughout. The main difference by offsetting the wings from the Capitol would be that the first door to the first meeting room or office would be a little further down the corridor than originally planned.

Senator Werk asked what was found when they drilled the monitoring wells and since we've been in a drought he wondered if they were taking into consideration that the water levels that are currently present are on the low side. Ms. Frew replied that the initial drillings that were done last fall were compared with other drilling sites that had been completed in the Capitol Mall area and those results were compared and an estimate of the water levels was made. Those estimates included a high of 25 feet below grade and a low of 32 feet below grade.

Senator Werk asked if an evaluation had been done of the Capitol property to know whether or not there might have been activity somewhere to know if we would find such things as contaminated soil, old footings from previous structures, etc. Ms. Frew stated that they have not done an environmental study of the property but they had completed 10 test holes in various locations and had not found anything of concern.

John Maulin, Restoration Architect, reviewed the draft floor plans for the garden level, 3rd and 4th floors. Within the garden level they were not able to grant all the requests for space so they offloaded some of the space requests to the garden level wings that would not fit into the basement. They offloaded LSO Central Administration, Information Technology, and some storage facilities and relocated those to the wing locations. The Legislative Library area was made a little bit larger with some added windows but the extra space and configuration allows for future office expansion if the library potentially changes its media style and requires less space for the storage of books.

Representative Jaquet commented to Jeff Youtz that she was surprised that so much space had been allocated for LSO Audit and asked if we really needed to accommodate that many people. Director Youtz replied that they are trying to set up a work space for each person in the Audit area since currently they share workspaces but he did reiterate that this was the first time he had seen these current plans and would like some time to review them. Mr. Maulin replied that these plans are the first real drafts and their goal is to start next week working closely with the people involved to refine these plans. Mr. Maulin did state that future expansion has been built into these plans for additional employees down the road.

Senator Werk asked where Office of Performance Evaluation would be located if it's approved. Ms. Frew replied that they had just received that request and that they had not made provisions for them on these plans, pending approval from this committee.

Senator Stegner stated that there was only a short time left for this meeting before the Relocation Committee meets and requested that this committee recess and reconvene at 1:30 pm in order to fully spend the time necessary to review these floor plans.

Mr. Maulin quickly went over the 3rd and 4th floor plans which were a different configuration than this committee originally looked at.

Senator Stegner commented on the plans for the JFAC area on the 4th floor and asked why the interior stairway that was previously discussed was not incorporated into these plans. Mr. Maulin explained that due to space constraints constructing the stairway was not feasible due to cost and the space configuration.

Representative Jaquet inquired about the JFAC conference room located on the 3rd floor and asked if the room on the plans was the same size as the current room, citing that the current space is not large enough to accommodate the JFAC committee in their early morning meetings. Mr. Maulin said it was slightly larger than the existing space.

Paul Brown reviewed the stacking diagram of the east and west wings. The Senate side kitchen and dining facilities are located near the stairs and elevators. There are 18 Senate offices which are designated for those who are not in leadership or committee chairs. There are six hearing rooms with committee chair offices adjacent to their respective committee rooms. The corridor runs the length of the committee rooms for easy access. The House side is very similar to the Senate side with the exception of more offices.

Representative Black stated that what he is hearing is that the budget is driving the need to reduce space. By reducing the square footage, what is the difference in the cost by doing this? Mr. Brown replied that they are working on the balance of reducing the square footage and maintaining the quality issues and that he does not have those numbers available for the committee at this time. He stated that presently there is generous space within the configuration of 100,000 square feet and they have surplus space in the upper levels so there is some flexibility in the concept of paring down some of the excess space but yet still allowing room for growth. He does not have a cost per square foot reduction in space at this time.

Director Youtz addressed the committee on the subject of keeping within the budget that has been alluded to this morning. He stated that the Legislature approached this 'once in a 100-year project' with a defined source of funding from the cigarette tax which will generate between \$20-\$25 million dollars a year until the project is completed. He realizes that construction costs are rising and has gotten the impression here today that the scope and the approach to how we complete this project has changed in order to stay within a budget number that was estimated a few years ago. He is concerned that the budget number is being used to drive the decisions and feels that this committee needs to look at what the vision is for the project and pursue the needs rather than worrying about keeping within a specific number. He did state that he does recognize the fact that staying within a budget is necessary but since we are only doing this once the current and projected needs of the legislature and the future use of the building need to take precedence.

Representative Jaquet stated that she would like to see the LSO Central Administration co-located with the rest of LSO where they would be closer to the Legislature.

Senator Stegner stated that he did not feel that Legislative Audit needed to take up as much space as indicated and questioned whether it needed to be located in the wings. He asked Director Ahrens if she would look into other space located in the Capitol Mall area to relocate Legislative Audit so it would free up additional space. Director Youtz stated that the Legislative Audit staff is not engaged in the day to day operations of the Legislature and as much as he would like to see all of LSO together with space limitations he would be fine if Audit was located in close proximity but not necessarily in the wings.

Senator Cameron wanted clarification on the necessity of the 25-foot space from the wings to the Capitol. Mr. Brown replied that it was both to protect the foundation of the Capitol and budget concerns. It's very expensive to construct the wings adjacent to the building in a safe manner. It's less expensive to begin construction at a distance and it's safer as well. They don't know exactly where the bottom of the footings is on the existing Capitol. There is an angle of repose that the soil provides bearing without shoring that they would like to stay within, if possible, so they don't have to place the load against the wall. They have the original drawings to refer to but they are not sure where the actual footings meet the ground.

Senator Cameron stated that he would like to see this project done right and not be confined to budgetary influences.

Director Ahrens commented that the situation where we're at presently is typical of a construction project in regards to design, needs, and budget restrictions. The resolution that was passed was an estimate of what the costs would be and there were things that were not included in that estimate. They knew those numbers most likely would go up as the project was finalized. The citizen's committee, the people who are voting on the project, the Capitol Commission, need to feel comfortable that the directive from the Legislature would allow them latitude in the budget. The Building Authority needs to feel comfortable in how much percentage over and above the cost estimate for construction they feel that they can issue bonds for. That is the current dilemma. The cost estimate for the project after everyone's needs have been addressed in the plans is considerably over and above the original cost estimate that the Legislature voted for. Director Ahrens stated that in her opinion the Capitol Commission and the Building Authority would not feel comfortable voting for something that they don't know has full Legislative support, even though it may be the right thing to do. Director Ahrens said she directed her staff to go back over the plans and to try to accomplish the same things but to be closer within the original budget, possibly within 10% over the budget, instead of the higher figures that have been projected. She does not think that the Building Authority will feel that they have the ability to go 20%-30% over the amount listed in the resolution.

Chairman Denney reminded the committee that currently we are out of time and asked Senator Stegner to review the list of items that Ms. Frew had requested guidance on earlier in the meeting.

Senator Stegner stated that in conferring with his co-chair, Chairman Denney, they did not feel comfortable that it was this committee's prerogative to make the appointments Ms. Frew requested, but the co-chairs will make their recommendations to the Speaker and the Pro Tem and then they can make those appointments for the Selection Committee and the designees to approve the final floor plans by the end of the Special Session tomorrow.

Chairman Denney asked the committee to review the plans during the recess and address them when they reconvene at 1:30 pm.

Chairman Stegner reconvened the meeting at 1:50 pm.

Senator Geddes presented the committee with a letter that Director Youtz had drafted during the recess addressed to Director Ahrens and copied to the Building Authority and the Capitol Commission which states HCR 47 that the Legislature voted on this past session was an estimate of the construction costs for the Capitol Restoration Project and that the Legislature had always intended that the funding of the project be fluid. The funding source for the Capitol Building and Mall improvements is open ended and will be funded by the cigarette tax. The Legislature always has the option to appropriate additional funds from the General Fund surplus or reserves in the tobacco funds to

augment the proceeds of bonds, or buy down the amount necessary to finance through bonds. Senator Geddes stated that the letter will be signed by the Speaker, the Pro Tem, Minority Leaders on both sides and the co-chairman of the Joint Finance Appropriations Committee.

Representative Deal made a motion to accept and agree with the letter that Director Youtz created and to send it to Director Ahrens, the members of the Capitol Commission and of the Building Authority. Motion seconded by Representative Jaquet. Unanimous consent to accept the motion as stated.

Chairman Stegner asked Director Ahrens if there was any significant problem with this committee considering trying to acquire extra space in the Capitol Mall for Legislative Audit to free up space in the wings. Director Ahrens stated that they would look at other locations within the Mall area for similar square footage. Director Youtz stated that he would like to sit down with both Mr. Maulin and Mr. Brown and review the space allocated to Legislative Audits.

Senator Geddes commented on the 3rd floor plans. He asked if they could take out the curve on the JFAC meeting room to enlarge the room similar to what the AG office had done previously on the 2nd floor. However, Ms. Frew did remind the committee that room needs to be historically preserved and the way the room is currently configured is the correct historical layout.

Representative Jaquet inquired if all committee rooms will have technology available in the form of screens where people could observe the proceedings if the rooms were full. Ms. Frew replied that some of the meeting rooms will have that capability but that it has not yet been determined if all the rooms will have that feature outside the doors.

Chairman Stegner asked about the internal stairway that originally had been asked for on the 4th floor behind the JFAC offices. It was determined that the inside space needed in sacrifice was not worth the advantage of having the stairway installed. Senator Cameron said that ideally he would like more access to staff on the 3rd floor but he doesn't want to give up the space needed for the stairway in lieu of office space.

Representative Jaquet commented on the fact that the JFAC co-chairs may want to be located closer to the LSO Budget Supervisor on the 3rd floor since they interact closely with that person. Also, she commented that the conference rooms located on the 4th floor need to be more accessible to the Legislature instead of tucked in the back.

Ms. Frew stated that 'designing by committee never works well' so what they are looking for is input and suggestions from this committee and not necessarily specifics. They will take that information and work on a plan to incorporate the needs and wishes if possible.

Mr. Maulin would like to know from this committee if the configuration of the plans presented today is inline with the general direction this committee would like to go. These drawings are preliminary and can be changed to reflect the desire of the

committee. He would like direction on the office space layout to make sure they have everyone covered.

Mr. Brown wants to understand how the space will be used so they can configure the plans to meet that use. He would like any problem areas identified today so they can go back and address those areas. He does not expect a design solution but wants to know where things are not working in this configuration so those areas can be reconfigured.

Chairman Stegner asked the committee for areas on the plans that need to be reworked. He stated that on the Senate side the Majority Caucus member is located on the 4th floor and he would like them moved to the 3rd floor. There is no position listed as “Chief of Staff” that is utilizing an office on the 3rd floor so that space can be reassigned.

Senator Geddes asked that the Fiscal Assistant and the Assistant to the Pro Tem each be given an office instead of sharing one as listed on the 3rd floor.

Senator Cameron also commented that the two storage areas located in the JFAC offices on the 3rd floor could be better used as office space.

Chairman Stegner asked that an area for the copy machines be created since currently they are out in the open in the hallways.

Representative Deal requested on the House side if the Majority Caucus member could be moved from the 4th floor down to the 3rd floor. He asked for access into the Majority Leaders office from the Secretary’s office on the 3rd floor. He would also like their copy machines to be relocated from the hallways into a separate area. He commented that there was no designated space for the House or Senate mailroom or a coatroom and asked that a space for those be considered.

Senator Cameron stated on the 3rd floor, Senate side, it was not a good idea to have the Pages located outside of the Docket Clerks offices. The House side has the Pages located on the 4th floor and he would like to see the Senate Pages located up there as well if possible. He suggested mirroring the 3rd floor of the Senate side with the same side of the House. He also suggested taking out some of the restrooms on the 4th floor to free up space but Mr. Maulin said that the way the conference rooms were set up that the restrooms would be an easier access for Senate/House use rather than having to go out in the rotunda area to use the restrooms.

Chairman Stegner commented that his recollection from the last meeting was that all leadership except for the Pro Tem and the Speaker was going to be moved to the 4th floor and these plans did not reflect that. He also recalled that there would be an addition to the current Caucus rooms and they would be designated as a lounge area and then there would be a large room for dining on the 3rd floor. Mr. Maulin replied that they could configure the office space better on the 3rd floor since there was more space. Ms. Frew stated that their impression at the last meeting through the minutes was that the Minority

Leadership did not want to be alone on the 4th floor so they attempted to located everyone on the 3rd floor.

Chairman Stegner suggested that the House and Senate each review their own needs and from those groups one person will report back to Mr. Maulin and Ms. Frew on the needs and desires of each house. Mr. Maulin asked if he could attend these meetings so he could better understand the thought process of the suggestions that would be made. It was suggested that this be done as soon as possible so that the suggestions could be incorporated into the next set of plans.

Mr. Brown took the opportunity during the break to reconfigure some of the plans on the wings based on the ideas that were talked about at the meeting this morning. Mr. Brown moved one of the committee rooms to the upper floor in order to allow immediate access to the wings which is a much more elegant entry and separated the wing from the Statehouse to eliminate any structural risk associated with being too close to the angle of repose. The perception of moving from the Capitol to the wings is preserved while moving the deeper footing away from the building which is safer and less costly.

Representative Black commented that he would like to see all legislators having an office in the wings and Representative Jaquet and Chairman Stegner concurred with this request.

Senator Cameron wanted to know why the office space was on the upper level and the hearing rooms on the lower level and Mr. Brown explained that the office space was closer to the natural lighting and the hearing rooms benefited from being on the lower level so the flooring could be sloped for the auditorium style seating needed in the larger rooms. However, the committee chairman offices are located on the lower levels next to their respective hearing rooms.

Chairman Stegner is asking the House and Senate members of this committee to convene in the next few days to map out their respective floor plans and he would like them to contact Mr. Maulin so that he can be present at those planning sessions.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:10 pm.